Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

thoroughgoing, as in the 'up-to-date historian,' it views all particular things and events as set over against the 'all-inclusive, self-perpetuating process' of the whole, which then is named universal environment, nature, fate, etc. Thus the parts of this total process are given a sort of isolation and independence, while the whole is treated as only another part, which imposes itself as a fatal process on all particular things, and especially on human life, robbing that of all interest and all initiative.

This materialism, then, lurks under the historian's patient study of minute, prosaic details. We have but to express it clearly to reveal its absurdity. For the whole can not be outside of, or fate to, anything. The conditions of life 'show only what life is, not what it has to be in spite of itself.' But to perceive this is to adopt the true, the dynamic idealism; it is to see that history is essentially history of the *whole,* which again is history of the *person.*[1] Such history alone is assured of dramatic movement and perspective; it is vital, not fatal.

The definition given of materialism assumes that wholes can be and are self-supporting, independent, in such a manner as is inconsistent with their being parts. No wonder that the author finds materialism everywhere, and especially in those 'boastful idealists' who most condemn it! For few would admit the existence of at any rate more than one such whole. And, especially, the wholes of which history treats, since they are movements that begin and cease, require a wider somewhat wherein beginning and end are situate. Of this containing somewhat the movement must in an important sense be a part, in whatever sense it be a whole.

As the realization of his concept of a dynamic whole that is part of nothing, the author finds only the 'living, urgent unity of experience'; which is the *person.* But can the unity of experience be living, or developing? Any movement of experience begins and ends *in* experience, and lies, therefore, as a whole within it. If there is a unity or a whole of experience that is part of nothing, it can not, therefore, be living or urgent. And how can it be a person? Persons have experience, and are in experience, their own and others', and a person sometimes is *an* experience; but surely he is never the unity of experience in the sense of a totality that is part of nothing.

Many will welcome this vigorous championship of constructive history, who yet may well insist that the work of the historian is not all of one type, and that minute prosaic details merit all the study that they now receive.

PERCY HUGHES.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA.

Die Schätzung von Bewegungsgrössen bei Vorderarmbewegungen. Dr. ROSWELL P. ANGIER. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie und Physiologie der Sinnesorgane,* Bd. 39, 1905, S. 429.

The paper deals with the estimation of movements made by the elbow-joint of the right arm. Since only one joint was used and the others carefully excluded from participation, the movements were necessarily circular. Straight movements, as with a pencil on a line, obviously call into play several joints, and thus make the physiological conditions too complicated for any reliable interpretation. Standard and compared movements, moreover, started from the same point. This is a variation from the arrangement of most other experimenters, inasmuch as usually the second movement, whether standard or compared, has commenced from the same position as that at which the first ended. Moreover, standard and compared movements were of certain prearranged lengths and the latter as well as the former were limited by mechanical bounds. The reason for thus limiting the compared movement is the following: if the subject merely tries to make a movement that seems like the standard movement his mental process has to be a complicated one; first, he has to estimate the size of the movement he is trying to reproduce, and second, he has, or ought, to judge how nearly his actual movement has approximated that which he intended, for these two are by no means always identical. Some of the errors of over- and under-estimation in the work of previous writers are probably due to the subjects' neglect to notice how their movement executed compared with the movement intended.

---

[1] Apparently because (p. 743) the whole of which history must treat is the development of the 'unity of experience.' Now the person is the 'living, urgent unity of experience.' Hence the person is the whole in question.

The right forearm moved in a horizontal plane about the axis of the elbow-joint, and between vertical rods, which limited the movements in both directions. The standard movement was through 10 cm. at the tip of the middle finger, while the compared movements ranged from 9.2 to 10.8 cm., by steps of 2 mm. Each comparison was made twice, once with the standard and again with the compared, as the first interval. A series consisted of ten such double sets, or 180 judgments. Series were taken with active and passive movements, against inertia and with inertia, starting with different angular positions of the elbow, and with different speeds. The results show that changes in the initial position of the arm or in the inertia against which or with which the arm moved, had no appreciable effect on the accuracy of estimation. The estimation was also the same in passive as in active movements. Differences in speed, on the contrary, markedly affect the estimation; and the more rapid movements were overestimated. It appeared from a special series that was taken that speed is of importance in affecting the estimation only when it is greater than the speed of the subject's natural rhythm. The bearing of these results on those of other experimenters is interestingly discussed. The author agrees with Goldscheiner that the estimation of movement depends on joint-sensations. The author proposes two theoretical possibilities for explaining the overestimation of rapid movements: firstly, "that the two joint surfaces move over each other more rapidly, . . . so that necessarily in the unit of time more sensory end-organs of the joint-surfaces are stimulated than would be in slower movements. These differences in the temporal relations of the physiological excitation may be the cause of the overestimation." Or it might be that on the cessation of movement some sort of jar occasions a sudden increase of the mutual pressure between the joint surfaces. Then by a sort of irradiation there might be an excitation of end-organs not directly stimulated, and these would be precisely the end-organs which would have been directly stimulated if the movement had continued farther. The author lays rather more stress on the latter hypothesis, of irradiation, than on the former. The theoretical discussion is clear and interesting, and brings to mention a considerable literature. E. B. HOLT.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

Vergleichende Bestimmungen der Peripheriewerte des trichromatischen und des deuteranopischen Auges. ROSWELL PARKER ANGIER. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie und Physiologie der Sinnesorgane,* Bd. 37, 1904. S. 401–413.

Visual stimuli of a given intensity appear colorless on the periphery of the retina, but they appear of different intensities. The different intensities in which the colors of the spectrum are so seen have been called by von Kries '*Peripheriewerte.*' These values are not the same as the series of gray-values in which a dim spectrum is seen by the (periphery of the) dark-adapted eye. Values of this latter series are called '*Dämmerungswerte.*'

Now for the normal eye the periphery-values are not the same as the twilight-values. The twilight-values are, however, virtually the same for both normal and all the kinds of color-blind eyes. But von Kries has demonstrated that the periphery-values are different for the normal and the protanopic (red-blind) eyes, and the present paper takes up this same point, hitherto uninvestigated, with regard to the normal and the deuteranopic (green-blind) eyes. The periphery-values were found by producing a spot of spectral light on a moderately illuminated gray field. Spot and field were then observed peripherally and the luminosity of the colored spot varied until the gray sensation that it gave appeared equally intense with that of the field. For purposes of comparison careful determinations were made of the periphery-values on three normal subjects as well as on a deuteranopic subject (Professor Nagel). The resulting tables and curves show that for the deuteranope the brightest point of the spectrum (seen peripherally) lies at wave-length 601, while for the normal eye it lies at 581; and these figures compare interestingly with von Kries's determinations for the protanopic eye, where the greatest periphery-value was found to be at wave-length 557. The periphery-values for the deuteranopic eye in question were found to be approximately the same as the distribution of brightnesses in the spectrum as seen (in colors) by the fovea. E. B. HOLT.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

Beobachtungen an einem Fall von totaler Farbenblindheit des Netzhautzentrums in einem und von Violetblindheit des anderen Auges. Dr. HANS PIPER. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie und Physiologie der Sinnesorgane,* Bd. 38, 1905, S. 155.

This paper is of special interest because the subject investigated possessed two kinds of color-blindness, along with fairly correct color vision